

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/511,062	10/12/2004	Masatoshi Kitagawa	82478-9100	2245
21611 SNELL & WII	7590 01/16/2008 MER LLP (OC)	,	EXAM	INER
SNELL & WILMER LLP (OC) 600 ANTON BOULEVARD			WALFORD, NATALIE K	
SUITE 1400 COSTA MESA, CA 92626			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	-, -, -, -, -, -, -, -, -, -, -, -, -, -		2879	·
		·	· ·	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/16/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

TH

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summer	10/511,062	KITAGAWA ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Natalie K. Walford	2879			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONEL	l. lely filed the mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 No	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>02 November 2007</u> .				
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b)☐ This	☐ This action is FINAL. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is				
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	3 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims					
4)	vn from consideration.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on 12 October 2004 is/are: Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	a) \boxtimes accepted or b) \square objected drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document: 2. Certified copies of the priority document: 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document: application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Application rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage			
Attachment(s)					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate			

10/511,062 Art Unit: 2879

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

The Amendment, filed on November 2, 2007, has been entered and acknowledged by the Examiner. Cancellation of claims 2-3, 10, 15-16, and 20 has been entered. Newly added claim 22 has been entered. Claims 1, 4-9, 11-14, 17-19, and 21-22 are pending in the instant application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 4, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shibata et al. (JP 11-120919) in view of Akiba (US 6,873,105).

Regarding claim 1, Shibata discloses a plasma display panel in figures 1 and 3 in which a plurality of pairs of first and second electrodes (items 1 and 2) are disposed on a first substrate (item 5) so as to be parallel to each other, a plurality of third electrodes (item 3) are disposed on a second substrate (item 8), and main parts of a plurality of barrier ribs (item 13) are disposed between adjacent third electrodes, the third electrodes being orthogonal to a longitudinal direction of display electrodes each of which consists of a pair of the first and second electrodes (see FIGS. 1 and 3), wherein a plurality of fourth electrodes (item 9) are fixed to the barrier ribs, the fourth electrodes being electrically exposed to discharge spaces which are defined by the

10/511,062 Art Unit: 2879

electrodes are inserted in the barrier ribs, as claimed by Applicant. Akiba is cited to show a plasma display panel in figure 5 that has an electrode (item 55) that is inserted into barrier ribs (item 74). Akiba teaches that by having an electrode in the barrier rib, sustain pulse voltage can be lowered, luminous efficiency is improved, and luminance is improved (column 1, lines 44-50).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Shibata's invention to include the plurality of fourth electrodes inserted in the barrier ribs as suggested by Akiba for lowering sustain pulse voltage and improving luminous efficiency and luminance.

Regarding claim 4, the combined reference of Shibata and Akiba disclose the plasma display panel of claim 1, further comprising: a plurality of fifth electrodes (item 9), which are inserted in the barrier ribs at a second distance from the first substrate.

Regarding claim 22, the combined reference of Shibata and Akiba disclose the plasma display device of Claim 1, wherein the plurality of fourth electrodes are at a first distance from the first substrate, and fixed to the barrier ribs in such a manner as to be inserted in the barrier fibs so as to form fight angles with an address electrode (see FIG. 5).

Claims 5-6 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shibata et al. (JP 11-120919) in view of Akiba (US 6,873,105) in further view of Yoshida et al. (US 6,489,722).

Regarding claim 5, the combined reference of Shibata and Akiba disclose the plasma display panel of claim 4, wherein the fourth electrodes are fixed to the main parts of the barrier

10/511,062 Art Unit: 2879

ribs (see FIG. 4), but do not expressly disclose that sub-parts of the barrier ribs, which bridge adjacent main parts of the barrier ribs, are substantially orthogonal to the third electrodes, and the fifth electrodes are fixed to the sub-parts of the barrier ribs, as claimed by Applicant. Shibata only shows the barrier ribs in one direction (see FIG. 3). However, Yoshida shows in figure 1 that the barrier ribs (item 29) go in two directions (items 291 and 292), and one is orthogonal to third electrodes (item A). Yoshida teaches that the discharge gas space is divided at an appropriate position in the column direction (column 4, lines 38-43), flicker is reduced, area of cross talk is decreased, and display fluctuation is reduced. The Examiner notes that Shibata teaches that it is known to have electrodes fixed to barrier ribs, so one with ordinary skill in the art would have easily contemplated having electrodes fixed to the sub-parts of the barrier ribs, as shown by Yoshida.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combined reference of Shibata and Akiba to include subparts of the barrier ribs, which bridge adjacent main parts of the barrier ribs, are substantially orthogonal to the third electrodes, and the fifth electrodes are fixed to the sub-parts of the barrier ribs as suggested by Yoshida for reducing flicker, decreasing cross talk, and reducing display fluctuation.

Regarding claim 6, the combined reference of Shibata and Akiba disclose the plasma display panel of any of claim 1, but do not expressly disclose that sub-parts of the barrier ribs, which bridge adjacent main parts of the barrier ribs, are substantially orthogonal to the third electrodes, as claimed by Applicant. Shibata only shows the barrier ribs in one direction (see FIG. 3). However, Yoshida shows in figure 1 that the barrier ribs (item 29) go in two directions

10/511,062

Art Unit: 2879

(items 291 and 292), and one is orthogonal to third electrodes (item A). Yoshida teaches that the discharge gas space is divided at an appropriate position in the column direction (column 4, lines 38-43), flicker is reduced, area of cross talk is decreased, and display fluctuation is reduced.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combined reference of Shibata and Akiba to include subparts of the barrier ribs, which bridge adjacent main parts of the barrier ribs, are substantially orthogonal to the third electrodes as suggested by Yoshida for reducing flicker, decreasing cross talk, and reducing display fluctuation.

Regarding claim 17, the combined reference of Shibata and Akiba disclose the plasma display panel of claim 4, but do not expressly disclose that sub-parts of the barrier ribs, which bridge adjacent main parts of the barrier ribs, are substantially orthogonal to the third electrodes, as claimed by Applicant. Shibata only shows the barrier ribs in one direction (see FIG. 3). However, Yoshida shows in figure 1 that the barrier ribs (item 29) go in two directions (items 291 and 292), and one is orthogonal to third electrodes (item A). Yoshida teaches that the discharge gas space is divided at an appropriate position in the column direction (column 4, lines 38-43), flicker is reduced, area of cross talk is decreased, and display fluctuation is reduced.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combined reference of Shibata and Akiba to include subparts of the barrier ribs, which bridge adjacent main parts of the barrier ribs, are substantially orthogonal to the third electrodes as suggested by Yoshida for reducing flicker, decreasing cross talk, and reducing display fluctuation.

10/511,062

Art Unit: 2879

Claims 7-9 and 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shibata et al. (JP 11-120919) in view of Sato et al. (US 4,423,356) in further view of Akiba (US 6,873,105).

Regarding claim 7, Shibata discloses a plasma display device ion figures 1 and 3 in which a plurality of pairs of first and second electrodes (items 1 and 2) are disposed on a first substrate (item 5) so as to be parallel to each other, a plurality of third electrodes (item 3) are disposed on a second substrate (item 8), and main parts of a plurality of barrier ribs (item 13) are disposed between adjacent third electrodes, the third electrodes being orthogonal to a longitudinal direction of display electrodes each of which consists of a pair of the first and second electrodes (see FIGS. 1 and 3), wherein a plurality of fourth electrodes (items 9m-9o), the fourth electrodes being electrically exposed to discharge spaces which are defined by the barrier ribs, but does not expressly disclose that the fourth electrodes are inserted in the barrier ribs and the plasma display device includes a driving circuit for applying a voltage to the fourth electrodes or for earthing the fourth electrodes, as claimed by Applicant. Sato is cited to show a plasma display device in figure 2 with fourth electrodes (item 11) that are connected to a driving circuit (column 3, lines 47-51). Sato teaches that by connecting these electrodes to a driving circuit that the fourth electrodes help cause charges to move in order to reestablish the proper potential (column 3, lines 65-56). Akiba is cited to show a plasma display panel in figure 5 that has an electrode (item 55) that is inserted into barrier ribs (item 74). Akiba teaches that by having an electrode in the barrier rib, sustain pulse voltage can be lowered, luminous efficiency is improved, and luminance is improved (column 1, lines 44-50).

10/511,062

Art Unit: 2879

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Shibata's invention to include the fourth electrodes are inserted in the barrier ribs and the plasma display device includes a driving circuit for applying a voltage to the fourth electrodes or for earthing the fourth electrodes as suggested by Sato and Akiba for reestablishing proper potential, lowering sustain pulse voltage, and improving luminous efficiency and luminance.

Regarding claim 8, the combined reference of Shibata, Sato, and Akiba disclose the plasma display device of claim 7, wherein the driving circuit applies a positive voltage to the fourth electrodes (Sato; column 4, lines 38-47).

Regarding claim 9, the combined reference of Shibata, Sato, and Akiba disclose the plasma display device of claim 8, wherein the fourth electrodes are at a first distance from the first substrate (Shibata; see FIG. 4), and fixed to the barrier ribs in such a manner as to be inserted in the barrier ribs or disposed on surfaces of the barrier ribs (Shibata; see FIG. 4, items 9 and 13).

Regarding claim 11, the combined reference of Shibata, Sato, and Akiba disclose the plasma display device of claim 9, wherein the driving circuit applies a first voltage pulse and a second voltage pulse to the first electrodes and the second electrodes respectively, and additionally applies a third voltage pulse to the fourth electrodes (Sato; see FIG. 2).

Regarding claim 12, the combined reference of Shibata, Sato, and Akiba disclose the plasma display device of claim 11, further comprising: a plurality of fifth electrodes (Sato; items 9m-9o) which are inserted in the barrier ribs at a second distance from the first substrate (Sato; see FIG. 4), wherein the driving circuit applies a fourth voltage pulse to the fifth electrodes when

10/511,062

Art Unit: 2879

outputting the first voltage pulse and the second voltage pulse at the same time (Shibata; see FIG. 2).

Claims 13-14, 18-19, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shibata et al. (JP 11-120919) in view of Sato et al. (US 4,423,356) in view of Akiba (US 6,873,105) in further view of Yoshida et al. (US 6,489,722).

Regarding claim 13, the combined reference of Shibata, Sato, and Akiba disclose the plasma display device of claim 12, wherein the fourth electrodes are fixed to the main parts of the barrier ribs (Shibata; see FIG. 4), but does not expressly disclose that sub-parts of the barrier ribs, which bridge adjacent main parts of the barrier ribs, are substantially orthogonal to the third electrodes, and the fifth electrodes are fixed to the sub-parts of the barrier ribs, as claimed by Applicant. Shibata only shows the barrier ribs in one direction (see FIG. 3). However, Yoshida shows in figure 1 that the barrier ribs (item 29) go in two directions (items 291 and 292), and one is orthogonal to third electrodes (item A). Yoshida teaches that the discharge gas space is divided at an appropriate position in the column direction (column 4, lines 38-43), flicker is reduced, area of cross talk is decreased, and display fluctuation is reduced. The Examiner notes that Shibata teaches that it is known to have electrodes fixed to barrier ribs, so one with ordinary skill in the art would have easily contemplated having electrodes fixed to the sub-parts of the barrier ribs, as shown by Yoshida.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combined reference of Shibata, Sato, and Akiba to include sub-parts of the barrier ribs, which bridge adjacent main parts of the barrier ribs, are substantially

10/511,062 Art Unit: 2879

orthogonal to the third electrodes, and the fifth electrodes are fixed to the sub-parts of the barrier ribs as suggested by Yoshida for reducing flicker, decreasing cross talk, and reducing display fluctuation.

Regarding claim 14, the combined reference of Shibata, Sato, and Akiba disclose the plasma display device of claim 7, but do not expressly disclose that sub-parts of the barrier ribs, which bridge adjacent main parts of the barrier ribs, are substantially orthogonal to the third electrodes, as claimed by Applicant. Shibata only shows the barrier ribs in one direction (see FIG. 3). However, Yoshida shows in figure 1 that the barrier ribs (item 29) go in two directions (items 291 and 292), and one is orthogonal to third electrodes (item A). Yoshida teaches that the discharge gas space is divided at an appropriate position in the column direction (column 4, lines 38-43), flicker is reduced, area of cross talk is decreased, and display fluctuation is reduced.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combined reference of Shibata, Sato, and Akiba to include sub-parts of the barrier ribs, which bridge adjacent main parts of the barrier ribs, are substantially orthogonal to the third electrodes as suggested by Yoshida for reducing flicker, decreasing cross talk, and reducing display fluctuation.

Regarding claim 18, the combined reference of Shibata, Sato, and Akiba disclose the plasma display device of claim 8, but do not expressly disclose that sub-parts of the barrier ribs, which bridge adjacent main parts of the barrier ribs, are substantially orthogonal to the third electrodes, as claimed by Applicant. Shibata only shows the barrier ribs in one direction (see FIG. 3). However, Yoshida shows in figure 1 that the barrier ribs (item 29) go in two directions (items 291 and 292), and one is orthogonal to third electrodes (item A). Yoshida teaches that the

10/511,062

Art Unit: 2879

discharge gas space is divided at an appropriate position in the column direction (column 4, lines 38-43), flicker is reduced, area of cross talk is decreased, and display fluctuation is reduced.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combined reference of Shibata, Sato, and Akiba to include sub-parts of the barrier ribs, which bridge adjacent main parts of the barrier ribs, are substantially orthogonal to the third electrodes as suggested by Yoshida for reducing flicker, decreasing cross talk, and reducing display fluctuation.

Regarding claim 19, the combined reference of Shibata, Sato, and Akiba disclose the plasma display device of claim 9, but do not expressly disclose that sub-parts of the barrier ribs, which bridge adjacent main parts of the barrier ribs, are substantially orthogonal to the third electrodes, as claimed by Applicant. Shibata only shows the barrier ribs in one direction (see FIG. 3). However, Yoshida shows in figure 1 that the barrier ribs (item 29) go in two directions (items 291 and 292), and one is orthogonal to third electrodes (item A). Yoshida teaches that the discharge gas space is divided at an appropriate position in the column direction (column 4, lines 38-43), flicker is reduced, area of cross talk is decreased, and display fluctuation is reduced.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combined reference of Shibata, Sato, and Akiba to include sub-parts of the barrier ribs, which bridge adjacent main parts of the barrier ribs, are substantially orthogonal to the third electrodes as suggested by Yoshida for reducing flicker, decreasing cross talk, and reducing display fluctuation.

Regarding claim 21, the combined reference of Shibata, Sato, and Akiba disclose the plasma display device of claim 11, but do not expressly disclose that sub-parts of the barrier ribs,

which bridge adjacent main parts of the barrier ribs, are substantially orthogonal to the third electrodes, as claimed by Applicant. Shibata only shows the barrier ribs in one direction (see FIG. 3). However, Yoshida shows in figure 1 that the barrier ribs (item 29) go in two directions (items 291 and 292), and one is orthogonal to third electrodes (item A). Yoshida teaches that the discharge gas space is divided at an appropriate position in the column direction (column 4, lines 38-43), flicker is reduced, area of cross talk is decreased, and display fluctuation is reduced.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combined reference of Shibata, Sato, and Akiba to include sub-parts of the barrier ribs, which bridge adjacent main parts of the barrier ribs, are substantially orthogonal to the third electrodes as suggested by Yoshida for reducing flicker, decreasing cross talk, and reducing display fluctuation.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

10/511,062

Art Unit: 2879

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Natalie K. Walford whose telephone number is (571)-272-6012. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8 AM - 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nimesh Patel can be reached on (571)-272-2457. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571)-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or

Page 13

10/511,062 Art Unit: 2879

access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Matal Ward

/Sikha Roy/

1/15/08

Primary Examiner, ArtUnit 2879